THE

"HINDU MESSAGE"

A Weekly Review of Indian and World-Problems from the Hindu Standpoint.

Editors: K. Sundararama Aiyar M.A., & T. K. Balasubrahmanya Aiyar B.A.

VOL. 2.] THURSDAY JULY 18, 1918. [No. 13.

The **Hindu Message** stands for

(1) The Maintenance of British supremacy with self-government for India,

(2) Co-operation with the different communities of India without prejudice to Hindu Dharma,

(3) Education of the Hindus as an integral part of the Indian Nation,

(4) Advancement of Material prosperity on a spiritual basis and

(5) Dissemination of pure Hindu Culture.

Annual Subscription Rs. 6 only.

For *bona fide* students Rs. 3 only.

Single copy As. 2 only.

All business communications and remittances to e addressed to the Manager and all literary contributions and books for Review to be addressed to the Editor, THE HINDU MESSAGE, *Srirangam.*

A Vision Of India.

THE GODAVARI—IV.

By K. S. Ramaswami Sastri, B.A., B.L.

Their blessed words of love made glad thy heart
Flooding it with devotion's raptures sweet
Though Ganga came from Vishnu's lotus feet
To thee a higher grace, a holier part
Both Vishnu's self and Laxmi did impart
By living by thy stream so broad and fleet
And choosing thee as their love's chosen seat
Ere they did on their southward mission start
And so the holy Ganga through the cycling years
Doth come to thee to show thee honour due
And save the world with joint purity,
O goddess come from bright celestial spheres
As pure within as fair to outward view
And from time's dawn sweet-mated to the sea.

The Hindu Message

THURSDAY EVENING 18 JULY, 1918.

Dr. Subramania Iyer on the Reform Report.

Dr. Subramania Iyer has written a letter to *The Hindu* containing his observations on (1) what should be the general attitude of the Indian people towards the Report; and (2) the principles on which Indians should base their criticism of the Report.

In offering observations on his views regarding these points, we wish at once to avoid all misunderstanding by saying that we think that the War Cabinet can and ought to find time for placing its own scheme of Indian reforms before Parliament and the public, British and Indian. What did they do as regards Ireland, where the present agitation for Home Rule began only about five years earlier than the Congress agitation for Indian progress and reform leading to self-government? The Ministry set about to prepare their own scheme. It is only the Irish rebellion and the obtaining of German help by Irish revolutionaries that has induced the Cabinet to drop their plans of legislation. Let us turn to India, where the conditions are altogether different and there is not a single section of the community, even of the most advanced sort, that can be called disloyal or disaffected. An organ of Anglo-Indian opinion in this Presidency has in the hope of inducing the Government to drop the question of Indian reform, come forward to suggest that there is a section of the new and educated Indian community who hope that the Germans will come out successful in the war. But the sentence containing the suggestion is so worded as to betray how poisonous and lying is the heart of the writer, whoever he is. It only helps, therefore, to make him hoist with his own petard and to expose to the world at large what a vile and venomous creature he is. He says:—"We in this part of the Empire are all of the same way of thinking,—except *perhaps* our local Bolsheviks who, to judge from their writings, *secretly* cherish the hope that Germany will win." The words we have put in italics in this sentence shows that the writer is not sure of his own mind, and that he is not at all convinced that the writings he mentions convey the interpretation he puts upon them. If the writer is honest, he would prove his statement by quoting the writings which have the meaning he suggests. And why has not Government prosecuted the disaffected scoundrels who have produced these "writings?" If the writings are capable of such an interpretation being put upon them, why does this Anglo-Indian organ only say of these dangerous seditionists that they "*secretly* wish the Germans' success"? Anglo-Indian writers who can produce such envenomed and mischievous writing ought to be avoided as the pests of society and kenneled and stowed away like maddened and ferocious animals into the asylum where they can be made to stew in their own juice. But to return from this digression, our point is that in India there are no seditionists or rebels,—secret or avowed. We are all constitutional agitators for the obtaining of our birthright of self-government,—

full of gratitude to Great Britain for the education and training she has given us, resolved not to lose our place of anchor within the broad and safe and cherished bosom of this marvellous and noble British Empire, and determined to gain our freedom and our lost self-respect. We are strongly of opinion that it is not right, and that it is also too late in the day, for Mr. Lloyd George's Ministry to plead that they are pre-occupied with the War. Why did they, then, make their famous declaration of the 20th August? Why did they send out Mr. Montagu at all? Dr. Subramania Iyer remarks that "if the Indian public gets exhausted in attacking a mere Report, it might not be in a position to fight the Cabinet scheme when it emerges. Our opinion is that each must be dealt with on its own merits. There ought to be no such thing as "exhaustion" in a modern national community. Exhaustion is possible in such a community only as a prelude to national extinction. There, indeed ought never to be "undue waste of time and energy." The nation must conserve all its resources. But for an Indian leader and possible candidate for the Congress Presidentship to speak of possible "*exhaustion*" in connection with a nation just aspiring and agitating for self-government smacks of a spirit of pessimism, possible or actual, which is altogether inconsistent with the vigorous adolescence which ought to characterise a community agitating and struggling for its birthright of freedom and for its place of self-respect among the free communities of the Empire.

In dealing with Dr. Subramania Iyer's two points above mentioned we shall take the *second* one first,—*viz*., the principles on which Indians should base their criticism of the Montagu-Chelmsford scheme. He mentions six points and on all of these, except the *first* one, we agree in the main with what he says. That *first* point we will discuss presently. The others are—(2) if any scheme does not give the final goal of full responsible government and indicate the steps towards its realisation, it should not be accepted. (3) Any scheme should provide for immediate changes all along the line leading to that goal. (4) The revenue and expenditure everywhere should be under popular control. (5) The system of election should be given due prominence in all parts of the scheme. (6) The Legislature should be made master of the Executive in all important matters.

Dr. Subramania Iyer's *first* point is:—"Anything which originates with foreigners violates the principle of self-determination." We think this is going too far,—for, if this is accepted *in toto*, the political, and civic life of the West will itself have to be condemned as coming to us from the West and therefore from foreigners. For ourselves, we are not much in love with European ideas regarding the aims and methods of public life, but we cannot, for the present at least, help the endeavour to secure self-determination according to European ideas and then to adjust it by slow and painless gradations to our common Hindu-Moslem conceptions of the higher life of man on earth. Dr. Subramania Iyer says about the Montagu-Chelmsford Report that "a strong, wholesale, and prompt rejection is all that is necessary." We are not quite prepared for this,—for we consider half a rupee, or quarter of

a rupee, or even two annas, in the Rupee is better than none at all. We shall not, however, stop the agitation for the full rupee. We shall not rest till we obtain self-government in full measure. Our endeavours must continue till the goal is reached.

We now pass to what Dr. Subramania Iyer calls "the general attitude of the Indian people" towards the Report. In considering this, Dr. Subramania Iyer forgets, in the *first* place, that the Cabinet has declared that it is pre-occupied with the War and is unable to prepare a scheme of its own, and that therefore it offers these schemes of Mr. Montagu and Lord Chelmsford for public criticism in order that Indians might have occasion to think constructively about reform rather than to continue their present game of rousing popular discontent. The two schemes now published contain the materials for the Cabinet's own scheme of the future which will be placed before Parliament in the form af a Bill. The public criticisms now offered on the schemes of Mr. Montagu and Lord Chelmsford may help the Cabinet in preparing such a sceheme. At least such is their hope. In the *second* place, Dr. Iyer condemns the Cabinet for "not keeping faith" and "deluding the Indian people,—though at the same time he says, "we are told that the Cabinet is busy." So, it is clearly not yet time to put forth the accusation of breaking faith against the Cabinet unless Dr. Subramania Iyer believes that the Cabinet is *not busy*. He also makes the rather extravagant statement that the Cabinet is in league with "interested parties" and wants "to suit their requirements." The only interested party we know is the British Indian bureaucracy and its British organ, the Indo-British Association. If the Cabinet is open to such an accusation now, they were open to it also when Mr. Montagu was sent out to India, and even before that event. It is not logical or sensible that the accusation should be made now. When Mr. Montagu was engaged in receiving representations and granting interviews while in India, several members of the Home Rule party in India declared their belief that he was going to give us a substantial measure of reform. The accusation, if it had been made earlier, would have have had some weight with the Indian public. But it has been delayed till Mr. Montagu makes his foolish and uncalled-for attack on Dr. Subramania Iyer for sending his letter to President Wilson, and hence it wears the ungracious aspect of a retort.

Dr. Subramania Iyer asks,—"If the Cabinet wanted a discussion, why should it not be raised on the Congress-League scheme? If the Cabinet is not sponsor to the Montagu-Chelmsford Report, and yet it is allowed the prominence because their name has been invoked, are they not breaking their much-talked-of principle of self-determination? Is that cardinal principle not to be applied to India even in a matter of public discussion?" This is practically an objection to the proposing of a scheme even by the Secretary of State or the Viceroy. This objection ought to have been put forward by Dr. Subramania Iyer when the Secretary of State came out to India. But, as Mr. Montagu had on one occasion made a speech in Parliament regarding the changed angle of his vision in regard

to India, our political leaders hailed his mission to India as the advent of an *avatar* and were constantly trying to discover whether his angle of vision was right, or obtuse, or acute, all the time he stayed with us. No one then thought that he came to India for any purpose other than to proclaim the full freedom of self-determination for India. Now that it is clear that he had no such aim in view, men are discontented, and Dr. Subramania Iyer has also his own special ground of discontent against Mr. Montagu. We fear that there is as much political credulity and imbecility in India as there is of intellectual credulity and imbecility. Not all the political debacles we have suffered during the last three hundred years have been of avail in training us in the lessons of public policy and diplomacy. We have still had no great Indian leaders,—at least we have none in this great crisis of our history, at least in this Presidency.

The Reform Proposals.

We have no doubt that the measures proposed for adoption by the authors of the scheme constitute an advance on the existing condition of affairs, but we maintain that they constitute no advance towards the granting of responsible government,—towards the subordination of the Imperial executive to the legislature, or even the granting of the power of the purse to the representatives of the people. We think that the division of the government into "reserved" and "transferred" departments is a serious blunder. Government is an organism, and to divide it means to undermine its strength and disable it. Besides the complicated arrangements made for the carrying on of the business of the two departments constitute a gross violation of the principle of unity and simplicity which must characterise the supreme centre of administrative control. What would the British people say if the British Cabinet were divided in a similar manner? No doubt, under exceptional circumstances created by the war, we find that certain heads of departments are excluded from the Cabinet, but the War Cabinet maintains its supremacy over those heads, and thus maintains the time-honoured practice of securing unity of aim for the supreme centre and source of power. No such merit can be claimed under the scheme of reform now published for the Indian Executive. At the same time, there are not wanting arrangements for preserving the existing machinery by which the bureaucracy which has ruled India for its own advantage will be enabled to maintain power and prestige unimpaired. For, there will be a standing committee of it present and influencing the administration of all departments of state, and the so-called "transfer" of certain departments of administration to the people will be only nominal. Of course, we have two kinds of administrations in the world,—one in which the practice is better than the system as it is conceived, and another in which this state of things is reversed. It may be that the Indian administration of the future belongs to the former class and not to the latter. But here we have in view the plan of government issuing from the brains of its authors like Minerva issuing from Jupiter's head, and our opinion is that it continues to arm the bureaucracy with the

immense powers which it at present possesses. In the third place, the creation of the Council of State and of the Grand Committees takes away with one hand what little amount of popular influence is allowed to enter within the province of government by reason of the popular system of election which is or may be conceded under the scheme. For the constitution provided for these institutions tends by no means to invest them with a truly popular or representative character, and official influence will continue to predominate in them almost to the same extent as now. In the fourth place, we come to the fourth and last of the fundamental defects of the scheme. We do not see that adequate provision exists anywhere for the automatic expansion of the present scheme into the completed scheme of responsible government which has been accepted as the goal towards which India is to be educated and which is to be developed in the early future of the history of this continent. Nowhere are any time-limits drawn or any definite steps mentioned which can be relied on as certain guarantees for the future development of the powers now granted or for their improvement so as to convert them into realities where they prove shams in the working. On the whole, we seem inclined to think that we have got precious little of popular control over the Government.

At the same time, we are not prepared to criticise the attitude of those who think that the scheme as a whole is a real advance and constitutes a definite stage of progress towards the goal of responsible government. We have never had much faith in paper constitutions. All our faith is in men, and we have had many great Englishmen as administrators in the past. It may be that, after the war, an entirely new spirit may be born among all Englishmen of culture and patriotism, and that it will lead to the extinction of the spirit of exploitation long dominent in the minds of Englishmen. If so even the bureaucracy may change in its aims and methods, and if so the reforms now proposed may be utilised by the men actuated by the new spirit of Imperialistic patriotism and so worked as to prove a real step towards the goal of responsible government for India. Those moderate Indian politicians who hail the present scheme as a substantial and satisfactory instalment of responsible government can only be justified if this new spirit of Imperial patriotism becomes the dominant factor in the administration and working of the British Empire in the future. We do not want to quarrel with those who hope for the prevalence of a New Heaven and a New Earth in the universe after the War But we may be excused for continuing to hold that man—even the Imperialist of the British Empire of the future—will remain very much the same as ever.

While we are not inclined to say that those are mistaken who hope for a substantial improvement from the scheme now published, we are not at all inclined to agree that the arrangements contemplated form a *substantial stage* towards the goal of responsible government. We have fully stated our reasons above, and therefore we differ entirely from those who think that " for the first stage on the road to self-government the recommendations go a substantial distance." We have repeatedly expressed the view that the

Indian people have had a great Imperial past and that therefore they are not incapable of exercising the privileges of a free and self-governing people. No reform scheme that does not recognise this fundamental fact of the situation in India can be accepted as satisfactory by the enlightened Indians of to-day. The Indians want to regain their self-consciousness and self-respect in the world, and must continue to agitate till they recover their birthright of self-government. Till then, we will gladly give every attempt at reform by Government a fair trial, but we will adopt every constitutional device to organise our people for the gaining of what we desire,—a place of honourable equality among the free nations of the Empire.

Notes and Comments.

A living writer says "Man is body as well as soul, and the two are closely inter-related." What is meant by *soul* in this sentence? If it means *mind*, then we can understand the sentence in its full import. We know that the condition of the body affects the mind, and *vice versa*. But even thus, is man nothing but body and mind bundled together? Are our experiences confined to the "*inter-relation*" between body and soul (or mind)? If this is the case, then our experiences can only be either the experiences of the waking state, or those of dream, for of those only we have consciousness while they take place and we have the memory of them when they cease, though such is apt to fade away. There is a *third* state—that of *dreamless sleep*,—what the Hindus call *sushupti*. Some Western thinkers have denied the existence of it, and say that those who deny that they have dreamed have only "forgotten their dreams." Of late, however, there is a tendency to recognise the existence of the state of *dreamless sleep*. The Hindus hold that it is a real and positive state for man,—for we have the *memory* of it in our own experience after waking from sleep. For we say, "I slept soundly, and all the time I was thoroughly unconscious of any experience." Still, the experience of this unconscious condition is implied in the memory of it which occurs after we awake from it. Such experience implies the existence of a seer or witness or person who experiences it. And if the fact that, at the time when this experience takes place, there is no mind which becomes conscious of it,—then who is this seer or witness of this experience of having no experience? He is above and beyond mind, says the Hindu psychologist. He is the real person, the soul, the Jivatman, the intelligent doer and enjoyer,—he for whom this body and mind serve as organs of sensation, action, enjoyment, experience. He is the real *Man*,—not the mere conglomerate of body and mind of which the Western thinker speaks—and is content to speak in all his investigations into psychology.

* * *

Moreover, over and above these three states of waking, dream, and dreamless sleep, the Hindus have, from time immemorial, practised the condition of *superconsciousness*, known as *Samadhi*,—the state in which the seer remains as seer, without the experience of any thing or state external to himself, whether it is his body or mind, or any object belonging to the external world. This *Samadhi* has recently been identified with what Tennyson used to speak of as "luminous sleep." But we conceive it is something even beyond that state. For, *Samadhi* is of two kinds,—(1) a lower, known as *Samprajnata Samadhi* in which the seer has his mind *one-pointed* (*ekagra chitta*) in which there is *one object only* sensed to the exclusion of all else and which, therefore, can be called *luminous*; and (2) a higher, in which there is *no object* sensed and the seer remains himself and rises to a condition in which he transcends both body and mind, and has no experience at all. This is known to the Yogins and Vedantins as *Svarupavastavam*, (*i.e.*,) the realising of one's own Self. This Self is the real Seer, witness, person, or *Man*,—not what the Western

writer (already mentioned at first) has referred to as "body and soul closely interrelated to each other."

*
* *

It is the search after, and finding of, this Self or Atman that has been regarded as the goal of life for man in India. All social, political, and religious institutions in India associated with the Hindu race and religion have had their origin, making, and history settled for them by this supreme effort and destiny of the Hindu people and society. Europe, on the other hand, has set its heart's aims on the acquisition of secular power and freedom, and her great communities have succeeded in accomplishing their aims by the exploitation and control of Asia and Africa. The time has come when the principle of self-determination will have to be applied for the building up of all nations, great and small, in all continents and in both hemispheres. Whether this principle is applied in its full extent or not in the future of the world's history, will depend on the putting forth of effort by each community belonging to the world's family of nations, and not simply on the league or compact which they will form at the close of the war. India must now make a supreme effort to obtain the recognition of her due place among the free communities of the Empire and of the world. Only then will she be able to gain the respect of nations. Only then will her voice be effective for good among the races of humanity. Only then will her efforts to influence the future of the world's civilisation and to help forward the cause of peace and good-will on earth be crowned with the success they deserve.

*
* *

Even in her fallen condition, she spoke to America, and through America to the nations of the West, at the famous Parliment of Religions held at Chicago. The trumpet call of Swami Vivekananda is still ringing in our ears, and others took up his work when the call came for it. Since, then, Indians have been inspired for the doing of the work of national elevation in various directions. Though the gaining of freedom promises to be an up-hill task, it is certain that it will be undertaken and fulfilled with the utmost cheerfulness and energy. The constitutional struggle for Indian national recovery may be a long one, but we are certain that only when it has gained its full measure of success the world will lend ear to her voice and mission and profit by the thoughts and words of her sages and Rishis.

*
* *

It is easy enough to speak of a league of nations when the war is over. But before such a league can be formed, men must learn to curb their worldly ambitions. This implies that men must learn that there are desires and pleasures purer far than those that appeal to man's senses and that the gaining of them is possible and practicable by Dharmic methods which are taught and practised in India and which are known as *Yoga*,—or *Raja-Yoga* in its various forms or processes. It is through the adoption of these methods that the ideals of *Vairagya*, or renunction of worldly desires, become possible and feasible for men. It is then that men will begin to strive for harmony and brotherhood, and the league of freedom among nations will materialise by slow degrees. Ethical and spiritual ideals influence each other, and also the practical observance of them in daily life. Mere aspiration or sentiment can never be enough, as we know well from the history of various movements, socialistic and other, for the establishment of universal brotherhood among men.

Olla Podrida.

The S. P. N. E, has become active again. The University buildings have been opened and a new girls' school has been launched. We are more afraid of the girls' school than of the University. If women are educated on wrong lines the results will be even more disastrous than in the case of the mis-education of men. Already a new unwillingness to accept the obligations of a calm social and spiritual life is becoming painfully visible in the case of our women. The distant boom of votes is coming nearer. If we burn the candle at both ends it follows that much of the candle will not be left.

*
* *

We have been hearing about the text-books scandal of late. There is a little book called *Indian Tales of The Great Ones* by Cornelia Sorabji, which is a prescribed text-book. And what a prescription it is, to be sure! Stories from everywhere and told anyhow with the most oppressively unreal illustrations that ever invaded a book—these are the ingredients of the prescription. May God bless the poor innocents!

* * *

A few days ago an N. B. was telling his friend in a loud complaining voice that the whole world was contained in one sentence in the Rig Veda and that yet the hard-hearted B's would not let the N. B's study the Vedas. That very day I read also the announcement that a Mahomedan took his M.A. Degree in Sanskrit in the Dharma Sastra and Mimamsa group in the Allahabad University. Perhaps he did so to justify the name Allahabad. The B's on their side know no Sanscrit in most instances and are proud of their English. The problem is a regular Chinese puzzle. I invite solutions.

* * *

Mr. Devasikhamani Pillai writes that very few people know that Sanscrit *mantras* and verses have wonderful medical properties in preventing and curing the diseases of the throat etc. Why should he cry himself hoarse? Let him save his larynx. We have all resolved to become sahibs and to speak English and English alone.

* * *

Nay, K. S. Seshagiri of Madras beckons us to fresh fields and pastures new and we desire to go there. He exhorts us in the name of Ramachandra and Mahadeva of Kailas. By the bye to what village does Ramachandra belong? What does he want us to do? That is your query, is it. Vide New India dated 6th July 1918. I have no time to say anything more.

* * *

The Indian Boy Scouts' Association has made its appearance again with the lotus and the star in New India on 6th July 1918. Please look for the new star through the telescope of your mind. A momentous announcement has been made that a paper called the *Indian Scout* is to begin operations and that a single copy will be sold at two annas.

SCRUTATOR.

Kalidasa's Works.

The limitation of space put upon me forces me to take for granted that the conventions of the Sanskrit *Alankarikas* about the power of a *Kavi* as *Kranta-darsin*, or one who sees beyond the limitations of time and place, the difference between the pleasure roused in the mind of the reader and that obtainable from sense experience of the beauties of external nature, the poet's power to combine within himself the functions of a sage, a philosopher and an artist, the *Sthayi* and *Tanmayi Bhavas*, the *Vyangya* and *Dhvani*, the powers *Abhidha*, *Lakshana* and *Vyanjana* of words, the musical elements as inherent in the *Avyakta* aspects of words to be utilised by a poet, the classification of a Kavya into Drisy and Sravya with reference to the manner of presentation to the readers, and the same into *Uditodita*, *Anuditodita* and *Uditanudita* with reference to the development of Rasa these and many other points without a knowledge of which it is difficult to judge the merits of a good poet, according to the *Alankarikas* are familiar to us. A detailed review of the poet even without entrenching on the field of the other writers is likely to occupy much time. I will therefore confine myself to a cursory review by way of answering a few of the criticisms hurled haphazard against the works of this master Artist.

Of the works known to us under the name of Kalidasa, nine have been accepted by all as the genuine productions of the original writer of that name. These are the three Mahakavyas of Raghuvamsa, Kumarasambhava and Meghadata, the three dramas of Sakuntala, Vikramorvasi and Malavikagnimitra and the three miscellaneous works of Ritusamhara, Srutabhodha and Vrittaratnavali Stuti.

European Orientalists have done their best to see and appreciate some of the

excellences of Kalidasa. Even where they have failed to do so their faults are not altogether unpardonable. Born in the midst of alientraditions and sentiments, nurtured with prejudices foreign to the Indian mind and infatuated with the pride of superiority of their own race, they cannot but find it hard to see with the trained eye of an Indian. But alas! that an Indian who from his cradle has breathed the atmosphere of Indian traditions and sentiments and in whose views runs the very blood of the sages upon whom he ventures to sit in judgment should commit blunders worse than that of a European is an undoubted moral degradation. We are forced to seek a reason for it either in one's vain desire to pass greater than an acknowledgly great author or in a selfish wish to get into the good graces of Herod by out-Heroding him.

One very serious charge brought by a new-fangled Indian Critic against the classic work of Raghuvamsa is that on account of its treating about the history of a number of kings, it lacks in unity and consequently fails to embody the regular development of Rasa. To my mind it only shows the incapacity of the Critic to appreciate the greatness of Indian genius. A family or race has as much right to individuality as a single member of it. Who could fail to see in Raghuvamsa an attempt on the part of Kalidasa to portray the fundamental characteristics of the Raghu Race? Why should the poet who commences his poem saying रक्षूणामन्वयं वक्ष्ये actually begin it with the life of the father of Raghu instead of with that of Raghu himself? Why should he abruptly end the same with that of Agnimitra the father of a posthmous child, so as to give room to the suspicion that he should have written some more Sargas. The answers to these questions will, I am sure, expose the vapidity of the above objection.

One of the chief characteristics of the Raghu race brought into prominence in the work is the inseparable love and devotion between husband and wife. Else how could this race have produced the man-God, Rama, whose love for his wife and other members of his family is even to-day the ideal of all Indian houses. While passing over the lives of many in which this family trait does not form a dominent note, he takes care to dwell at some length on others in which there is a manifest expression of this love. In Agnimitra alone he finds a fitting character to close his poem with. When this king was on his death bed his wife was carrying in her womb the hope of the race. He therefore exhorts her to fulfil the vow of the race not by accompanying him in death, but by living for the love of him who is to be born again in her for the perpetuation of the race. Kalidasa takes advantage of this to end his poem auspiciously. It is therefore clear that there is complete unity in the poem.

Admitting the existence of unity there will be no difficulty in showing the *Udito-dita* character of the *Rasa* as developed in the poem. The higher aspect of love, *Vira* as merged in *Sringara*, is prominently portrayed in three places—once at the opening in the love between Indumati and her lord, once in the middle in the love of Rama and Sita and once again in the end in that of Agnimitra and his queen. These form, as it were, the three land-marks in the progressive development of the higher love portrayed in the poem. The force of love is expressed in the first instance by the death of king Aja following that of Indumati. In the scond the intensity is enhanced by the pangs of separation. In the last, the pangs of hopeless separation is added the necessity to live for the love and memory of the deceased beloved in obedience to his orders to live and rule his kingdom.

Kalidasa's speciality is that he is an adept in the art of applying *Samvrita Sringara* to human actions and passions. In Raghuvamsa the divine character of Rama seems to have handicapped him to a certain extent in exercising his art and developing the *sringara* to an appreciable degree. Kalidasa finds in the story of Dushyanta and Sakuntala a close parallel to that of Ramayana. He utilises this for effectively portraying the sublime love of Rama and Sita so uniquely described by Valmiki. From this point of view Kali-

dasa's Sakuntala may be said to be a fitting sequel to his Raghuvamsa.

In this connection it is worth while to know something about the philosophy of love. Srimad Bhagavanta has laid down that all human emotions are but the manifestations of the one transcendental love. Hatred itself is only love turned towards an object that stands between one's self and the object of his love. So also with other emotions according to the circumstances under which this love manifests. Human beings can realise the Supreme Love only through its manifestations in themselves. A good poet who endeavours to teach this higher love should therefore converge all the human emotions towards their common source. Love towards lower orders of beings is *Daya* or *Karuna* ; love towards equals is *Prema* or *Sneha* ; and the same when manifested towards superiors is *Bhakti*. In Sakuntala Kalidasa has successfully made use of the different forms of love to teach the grandeur of the supreme love at the back ground. The unselfish love of Sakuntala to tho trees and plants of the *Asrama* watered by her, her love for the deer, her *Sakhis*, her adoptive parents, and above all to her insulting lover are described with a peculiar zest which is Kalidasa's own and remind the readers of the power of that higher love.

Another criticism against Raghuvamsa is that the commonly accepted benedictory stanza of the work is not the composition of Kalidasa. The reasons assigned for it are that in the other two *Kavyas* there is only *Vastunirdesa*, that the *Visishtadevata namaskara* to Parvati Paramesvara in the present stanza is to be found in none of his other works, and that the relation of Vak and Artha therein is difficult to grasp for beginners into whose hands the book is generally put.

Before I question the Critics knowledge of the philosophy of this relation which is acknowledged by all to be that between *Prakriti* and *Purusha*, I would ask him in return to say who is the better subject to appreciate the correlation of word and its meaning—whether an advanced scholar whose mind is stuffed with the higher philosophy of the relation or a beginner who is being taught to associate every word with its proper significance? And are there not passages in the work more abstruse than this even for advanced scholars? As to the legitimacy of Vastunirdesa in this work also, we shall take the opinion of the Alankarikas in this matter. The alternatives of *Asih* (benediction), *Namaskriya* (salutation) and *Vastunirdesa* pointing to the subject of the work prescribed by them are not to be understood as independent and exclusive of one another. They are to be understood only as different forms of the one method of writing the opening stanza. Each of them therefore involves the spirit of the others also. This stanza whichever may be its form should always contain a key to the unravelling of the plot developed in the work. A clever poet like Kalidasa who had a clear vision of the point before him could not have opened the work with a better stanza. From the plot of view of the critic himself it would be absurd to expect *Vastunirdesa* in a work which treats about a series of kings. No form other than the unique invocation of *Visishtadevata* could have suggested to the mind of the readers the inseparable love portrayed by the author as the chief characteristic of the race of Raghu. A poet of Kalidasa's precision who has taken care even to name his works with due consideration to the central point of the plot could not have failed to use his discretion in framing the benedictory verse.

One point more I shall mention about this grand epic of Kalidasa. The name Raghuvamsa adopted by the poet has in my opinion some history to tell. The ancient *Alankarika* Bhamaha quotes from a work called Asmakavamsa by a Sakavriddhi in illustration of the melefluous *Vaidarbhi* style of composition. Whereas other critics known to us have only Kalidasa's poem to quote from for this style. According to the Puranic history Asmaka is the 13th in descent from the first founder of the Raghu Dynasty : whereas Raghu himself is the 21st in descent from him. From this, it appears to my mind that the earlier poet Sakavriddhi wrote

the history of the illustrious kings of this line from Asmaka down to Raghu in the famous *Vaidarbhi* style; and Kalidasa continued from where he left and wrote his Raghuvamsa in the same style. In the absence of this elder work of Sakavriddhi it is not possible to say how far Kalidasa is original and how far he is indebted to others for his work.

A similar criticism has been hurled against Kumarasambhava also. The last nine cantos out of the seventeen of this work has been stated not to be Kalidasa's. The reasons urged therefor are that the *Taraka-vadha* described therein does not justify the name Kumarasambhava, that there is no commentary by Mallinatha for the portion, and that the style of this portion is not in the usual strain of Kalidasa. Here also I have to point out that according to the Canons of the *Alankarikas* no subject can be deemed complete unless the result be given. Siva and Parvati who are above all human considerations and emotions have nothing to gain for themselves by the birth of Kumara. The story will not therefore be complete unless the destruction of Taraka for which Kumara was given birth at the prayer of the gods is described. Besides the story of the birth of Kumara actually closes with the eleventh canto; and the destruction of Taraka is described in the last three cantos. That Mallinatha did not comment beyond the eight cantos has no value as an argument. Mallinatha has not said any where as he has done in his commentary of Meghaduta, that he did not comment on this portion because Kalidasa did not write it. Either he commented on this portion also of an important epic which has a religious significance to the Hindus and the same has been lost to us, or the portion not being read popularly he did not care to comment upon it as in the case of Naishadha. As to the diction, if we admit that Kalidasa is an expert in the art of writing he should be credited with some discretion in adopting the peculiar style found in this portion. The portion is Vedic both in spirit and matter; and a rhythmic or *dandaka* style is what is generally employed by poets for addresses to Siva and Durga. Moreover in the book poetry may be said to end with the birth of Kumara; and the incidents after this do not give ample scope for the display of poetic excellence. To make up for this and with a view to increase the effect by a varying style, Kalidasa might have purposely chosen the style employed. Further, the portion condemned is in no way vevoid of the usual mannerisms of Kalidasa so as to be regarded as unworthy of him.

(*To be continued.*)

Dharma—VIII.

By K. G. Natesa Sastri, Vaidya Visarad.

Before dealing with the reply of the Mimamsakas let us see how far Mrs. Besant's "Historical Criticism", which again, according to her, means "Higher Criticism" agrees with the principle of interpretation enunciated by the Buddhists. Says Mrs. Besant: "And I say, before you bow your heads to a Smriti, find out about its date, find out about its author, find out why it claims authority. For times change, one age succeeds another and every Smriti is written for a certain age. None of them would have been useful before its time, nor is useful after it." (*Wake up India Foreign Travel*). And why all these? Because she says, "Are you sure that what you say is authentic and that there are not many interpolations to be found therein, that many errors may not have crept in?" To an ordinary hearer these words of appeal may seem absolutely sane and sound; in fact she has succeeded in entrapping many an honest man by persuations of this sort. Wherein lies the flaw in arguments of this sort nobody cared to know. But of this later on. Now let us see what the Buddhists have said. In the words of the Great Bhatta Kumarila, that vigorous

---

The Hindu Message will be posted regularly every week to any address in India, Burma and Ceylon on payment of Rs. 6 only per annum; For all foreign countries within the Postal Union it will be despatched on payment of 10s. 6d. per annum. All subscriptions are payable in advance and should be remitted to the Manager, "*The Hindu Message*", Srirangam.

expounder of *Purvamimamsa*, they say "तस्मात् कारणशुद्धत्वं ज्ञानप्रामाण्यकारणम् " which means " for a knowledge to become *Pramana* or *valid*, its source must be pure." Or in the words of Mrs. Besant this contention may be put thus :—" Before accepting a knowledge to be *Pramana* find out about its source, its date, author etc ". We now clearly see that if Mrs. Beasant's method of investigation may be called " Historical criticism " surely we may maintain that the Buddhists know this method better than she. In fact the Buddhist method of criticism was nothing but the modern Historical method or the " Higher criticism " as Mrs. Besant terms it.

Now we shall pass on to our subject and see the Mimamsaka reply to this : The vigorous Bhatta, in reply, says "स्वतः सर्वप्रमाणानां प्रामाण्यमिति गृह्यताम् । न हि स्वतोऽसती शक्तिः कर्तुमन्येन शक्यते ॥" The sloka means :—" Admit that the *Pramanya* or validity of every *Pramana* originates of itself at the outset; For the ability or power which a thing has not of itself at the outset cannot afterwards be imparted to it by another thing " Parthasarathi Misra, the renowned author of *Sastra Dipika*, puts this contention of Bhatta at some length and for ready reference, we quote the passage : Says he, यदि हि सर्वमेव ज्ञानं स्वविषय तथा त्वावधारणे स्वयमसमर्थं विज्ञानान्तरमपेक्षेत, ततः कारणगुणसंवादार्थक्रियाज्ञानान्यपि स्वविषयभूतगुणावधारणे परमपेक्षेरन्, अपरमपि तथेति न कश्चिदर्थो जन्मसहस्रेणाप्यध्यवसीयेतेति प्रामाण्यमेवोत्सीदेत् " इति ।

The passage means :—" If, as you maintain, all knowledge, being unable to impress, by itself, its own purport, requires the assistance of another ज्ञान or knowledge, then that knowledge required as help, such as the knowledge of the source merits, corroboration, and facts, also require the assistance of another knowledge to establish its purport and so on *ad infinitum*. In the end not a single fact can be established even after a thousand birth. To put shortly the science of Pramana will be quashed ". A bit of explanation is required before proceding further. What the Buddhists maintain is that mere knowledge alone of a certain thing is not sufficient to establish a certain thing. The knowledge that was obtained first must be strengthened by further knowledge obtained by corroboration, or the examination of the source of the first knowledge or of the merits or demerits of it. Says Parthasarathi—"पश्चात् कारणगुणज्ञानात् संवादज्ञानादर्थक्रियाज्ञानाद्वा प्रमाण्यावगमात् " इति ।

Hence the Buddhists declare, just after the manner of our modern historians and research workers, that a knowledge must be corroborated. To this the reply of the Mimamsakas is that how is the validity of the corroborative knowledge to be admitted ? If the first ज्ञान or knowledge cannot impart its purport by itself how can the other knowledge which is used for corroboration, impart its purport. If you want to be consistent in your theory, you must require a third knowledge to establish the validity of the second knowledge and this third knowledge requires a fourth knowledge for its very existence, and the fourth a fifth and the fifth a sixth and the sixth a seventh and so on. Then where are you going to rest ? Is it not ridiculous to contend that a knowledge obtained at first is unable to impart its purport, when we actually feel and know that it imparts its sense the moment we get that knowledge. To take a concrete example, the daily cablegrams bring fresh news from the war theatre which we read in the papers. The moment we read the passages their meanings are imparted to our mind and we get a fresh knowledge of the position of the war theatre. That knowledge did not require an assistance in the shape of corroboration etc. to impart its विषय or purpose or purport. It may be contended that what the Buddhists really meant was not that a knowledge cannot impart its purport by itself, but we must not venture any conclusion on that knowledge alone, but we must wait till any corroboration is obtained. So far sensible, but what is the time limit for a man to wait for the corroboration ? And if unfortunately for either of us, no corroboration is obtained what are we to do with our first knowledge ? To draw conclusions from it or reject it

---

Our Present Situation, Social and Religious

BY

G. Ramachandra Aiyar B.A., B.L.

Price per copy As. 2 only.

altogether? The Buddhists have not answered satisfactorily. We hope Mrs. Besant will favour us with her answer. In the next article we shall see the Mimamsakas.

The Great War of the Ramayana.

(An allegorical Interpretation)

[By K. S. Ramaswami Sastri, B.A., B.L.]

I

The greatest of all wars as old as the world, as long as life, as distracting as night, and as sure in its ultimate result as the struggle of light and darkness is the war of soul and sense. As we read the history of man, we see this war waged with varying fortunes. There are ages of belief and ages of unbelief, ages of integration and ages of disintegration, ages of Godwardness and ages of hellwardness. Goethe has well said: "It must be noted that belief and unbelief are two opposite principles in human nature. The theme of all human history, as far as we are able to perceive it is the contest between these two principles. All periods in which Belief predominates, in which it is the main element, the inspiring principle of action, are distinguished by great, soul-stirring, fertile events and worthy of perpetual remembrance. And on the other hand, when Unbelief gets the upper hand, that age is infertile, unproductive, and intrinsically mean, in which there is no pabulum for the spirit of man, and no one can get nourishment for himself."

The present age in India is, so far as social life is concerned, a time of intense and passionate, though silent, struggle between two opposite theories of life. Let not the "social reformers", as they call themselves, imagine that this is not the first time that Hindu society feels the impact of democratic concepts. Buddhism and Islam assailed it, and though it is grateful to them for certain healthy reactions within itself, they had no influence over its soul. They effected a shaking off of the torpor that had come upon India, a reassertain of her essential social and spiritual ideals, a new awareness of herself, a heightened sense of her mission and her destiny. As Sister Nivedita well says in her *Footfalls of Indian History*: "The sense of unity can only occur, as a spiritual reaction on the mind, against a manifoldness." The manifoldness of the neo-democratic concepts is sure to have the old result of a new purification from within, a reassertion of India's immemorial social and spiritual ideals, a vital expansion of the spirit. But it will no more overthrow her lofty and unique social and spiritual ideals than her old foes from within and without.

The caste system as rightly understood is no menace to national unity, no foe to democratic life of the proper type, no enemy to social progress. It co-existed with a great and memorable past when the swelling tide of national life overflowed the limits of the land and fertilised other countries. It is an absurd notion to hold that even in the true caste system as laid down in our scriptures there is any implication of superiority or inferiority in respect of a whole caste. Though the true Brahmana is a lofty type of manhood, none of our scriptures says that even degenerate Brahmins are as worthy of reverence as the true Brahmana. A famous stanza in the Bhagawatha says that a pariah who is full of true love for God, is better than a proud Brahmin vain of his birth and of his learning. The fact is that while man as a whole has certain great duties certain *additional* duties have been allotted to each of four castes forming the Hindu race. There is no inherent superiority or inferiority in regard to the sum of such additional duties for each of the fore castes. As well might the Sun be proud of shining by day or the stars of shining by night or the fire of shining at all times! This heavier load of duties for each of the four castes as compared with the duties of men in general ought to lead to humility and fear that we be unequal to the demands of such duties upon our moral energies. Sri Krishna has declared that He has created the four castes and that His love is won by every man doing his duty disinterestedly in a spirit of love of man and God. To pretend to revere Him while acting against His commands is the most despicable form of hypocrisy, and yet He is on the lips of many a friend of our society who seek to reproduce by any means here the European ordering of society.

Sir George Birdwood says: "The real danger which threatens India is that the caste system may be broken down. That would mean the ruin of India. It would

make India the East End of the World.." Sir Henry Cotton said: "The system of caste far from being the source of all troubles in Hindu society, has rendered most important service in the past, and still continues to sustain order and solidarity." Purity of race is essential to the preservation of our type, and it depends upon pride of race. Pride of race has from time immemorial depended in this land on the caste system, and each caste has had a noble record of honourable achievement of national service and spiritual life. To ruin the caste system and that at the present low stage of our economic life is the most powerful weapon against the purity of our type which has lived with unimpaired vitality through the centuries while other civilisations cœval with it and even younger than it have disappeared for ever.

We are fully aware of our deficiencies, and we are passionately seeking to set our house in order. We are as desirous of true reform as the so-called social reformers say they are. But our Marichas will not let us be. They dangle before our eyes golden mirages, and we alas! know not as yet that these are "such stuff as dreams are made of" and will fade like an "insubstantial pageant" and "leave not a rack behind." The better is the enemy of the good as the proverb says; and our friends will not let us do the little good that we can do because they keep us in a state of perpetual wrangle as to which is the better.

II

Rama—Dharma.
Laxmana—True Spirituality.
Jatayu—Scripture.
Sugriva, Honuman, Neala and other monkeys—Virtues.]
Vibhishana—Sincerity.
Ravaua—Materialism.
Maricha--Social Revolutionary.
Sita—Mother India,
Trijata—Devotion.
Rakshasas—Vices.

The moral of the Ramayana is plain enough. India is being entrapped by the honeyed words of the social revolutionaries. She heeds not the wise words of Spirituality or Dharma. She forces Dharma to leave her side on a foolish quest in her infatuation for the social revolutionary. The social revolutionary, when unable to withstand Dharma, falls dead crying out as if Dharma were slain. India then forces Spirituality to leave her side. Seeing a favourable opportunity Materialism pounces upon her in a seemingly pure garb and carries her away. Scripture makes a last stand to protect her, but is overwhelmed by the forces of Materialism. By itself it can do but little unless Dharma and Spirituality aid it. India is now a prisoner in the domain of Materialism. Vices assail her but she keeps the treasure of her soul untarnished. Devotion gives her comfort; but devotion by itself cannot rescue India unless helped by Dharma and Spirituality. Dharma and Spirituality then get the help of social, civic, and national virtues and cross the sea of sorrow and closely invest the citadel of unrighteousness. Devotion and Sincerity which were sent by God to be a source of purification and uplift to Materialism depart from it as if it scorns them. Unrighteousness is eventually slain. India is reunited to Dharma and lives for ever in sovereign splendour on the throne of the world's heart.

Correspondence.

The views of our contributors and correspondents do not necessarily reflect the policy of this Review—Ed.

The short-cut to Indian 'Swaraj'

Indians demand COLONIAL HOME RULE "as citizens of the British Empire". India is the largest, richest and most populous part of the Empire, *Democratically* governed by the King- Emperor in England.

1. The cheap and ready means to secure Swaraj for India is to submit to His Majesty (1) That India should be placed under the Colonial Secretary like Ceylon which should be added to the Presidency of Madras, and (2) That the Viceroyalty of India should be hereditary in the Second Son of His Majesty settled at Delhi.

2- Of course there will be a Constitution for the Vice-regal Government as demanded by the Indian Congress and Muslim-League; and it will be controlled by His Majesty and Prime Minister in Parliament.

3. A separate Secretary of State with a council for India is an extravagant obstruction to Self-Government.

A. SANKARIAH F. M. U., P. F. H. S.

TO MY GURU.

(Adapted from Hogg's Ode to the Skylark)

Soul of the wilderness,
Blithesome and cumberless,
Sweet be thy presence, so stainless and free!

Emblem of happiness,
Blest is thy dwelling-place,
Oh! to abide in the desert with thee!

Sweet is thy voice and strong,
Powerful to right the wrong,
Love gives it energy, love gave it birth.

How pure thy inmost heart!
How great thy noble part!
Thy soul lives in Heaven, thy body on Earth.

O'er hills and dales unseen,
Midst copse and mountain green,
With thy disciples, ere closing of day,
Over the woodlands wide,
By the sweet river's side,
Happiness thou teachest,—revealest the way.

Then when the gloaming comes
Low, midst the champak blooms,
Sweet will thy prayer and God's worship be.

Emblem of Happiness,
Blest is thy dwelling-place,
Oh! to abide in the desert with thee!

B. DASAPPA.

Deputy Inspector General of Education, Mysore.

पुण्याश्रमप्राणसमस्वरूप
भो भो महानन्दनिधे निराधे ।
त्वत्संनिधानं भुवि निष्कलङ्कं
सदाप्यनिर्बन्धमनोहरं च ॥

मुदामभिज्ञानमयस्वरूप
त्वदीयवासस्थलमेव पुण्यम् ।
रहस्त्वया साकमरण्यवासः
कीदृक्प्रमोदातिशयप्रदो वा ॥

वाचस्त्वदीया मधुराश्च शक्ताः
दोषापनोदेषु परस्य पुंसः ।
तस्यास्तु शक्तेर्नियतं निदानं
प्रजासु ते वत्सलतैव नूनम् ॥

कियत्तवान्तःकरणं विशुद्धं
पूज्यं पदं ते कियदुन्नतं वा ।
चेतः परे ब्रह्मणि लीयते ते
कायः परं क्रीडति मादृशैस्ते ॥

शैलाग्रेषु वनोदरेषु च महाद्रोणीषु सच्छाद्वल-
क्ष्माभृद्रम्यनदीतटेषु विटपिष्वभ्रंकषेषु स्वयम् ।
आत्मीयैरनुयायिभिः सह मुदा संध्यामुखे संचर-
न्नानन्दं परिबोधयस्यनुदिनं तन्मार्गदर्शी च नः ॥

निशान्धकारेऽङ्कुरिते समन्ता-
त्सुपुष्पिते चम्पकषण्डमध्ये ।
स्तोत्राणि देवस्य च पूजनानि
त्वत्कल्प्यमानानि मनोहराणि ॥

मुदामभिज्ञानमयस्वरूप
त्वदीयवासस्थलमेव पुण्यम् ।
रहस्त्वया साकमरण्यवासः
कीदृक्प्रमोदातिशयप्रदो वा ॥

Our Social Problem and the Bhagavad Gita By K. S. Ramaswamy Sastri B.A., B.L.

Price per copy Annas 4 only,

For 50 copies Rs. 10 only.

Printed and Published by T. K. Balasubrahmanya Aiyar B.A. at the Sri Vani Vilas Press, Srirangam.